



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

example of moral action at the present day. The founders of that Society had worked hard with the view of promoting knowledge, and were urged to make these exertions for the purpose of doing good. The Jews had done nothing of a similar kind. They were worshippers of one God, and that was all they professed to have done and taught us. It was said that they had shown great moral power, because they had submitted to death for the sake of their religion; but it would be found, on examination, that the religious party of the Jews were opposed to resistance to the Assyrians. But, assuming that they did prefer death to political subjugation, and that, as in the time of the Romans, they preferred death in the breach of the walls of Jerusalem, to submission to a foreign ruler, such conduct was not approved in modern days, nor was it considered morally right to sacrifice life when all had been done that was possible in defence of any principle. Mr. Heath alluded with approbation, as an illustration of modern notions of morality, to the conduct of the Confederate States of America, who, after having done all that they could to maintain their independence, when they found themselves irretrievably overpowered, in a most remarkable manner allowed that they were so, and gave in. That was, he considered, a moral victory of the people, and was far superior, as an example of morality, to the conduct of the Jews, who threw themselves into the breach with stubborn perversity, like animals.

Dr. CHARNOCK wished to know why the author of the paper spoke of the Gauls and the Celts as if they were distinct peoples. The Celts or Κελται were the Γαλαται, *i.e.* the Galli or Gauls. He supposed when Mr. Groom Napier mentioned the Celts, that he referred to the Cimbri. The author of the paper considered the Huns were not Tátárs, and he placed the Calmucks among what he called the “grasping nations;” but it was notorious that the Huns were the same people as the Calmucks, who were of Mongol origin. And were not the Huns also a grasping nation? Did they not at one time grasp a large portion of Asia, and over-run a considerable part of Europe!

The CHAIRMAN made some objections to several parts of the paper. He thought that nothing could be less spiritual than the laws of Moses; and with regard to the Greeks, Slaves, and Albanians, no persons could be less similar, and they ought not to be grouped together. With regard to what was said about the Huns, he regarded that race rather as Magyars than Huns. He denied also the great intellectual superiority attributed to the Greeks as a people. Those men who by their great intellectual superiority gave a high character to Greek literature, were but a small portion of the nation, while the great body of the people had no pretension to be considered as distinguished for intellect.

The following paper was then read:—

Resemblance between Man and Animals. By C. O. GROOM NAPIER,
F.G.S., F.A.S.L.

(Abstract.)

I have for many years thought of man as the microcosm, and have been led to examine nature in her lowest as in her highest forms; and have found illustrations of man in every department.

There are two ways in which man is illustrated by lower forms of life. The first and most extensive is by analogy. The second or more confined is by an actual likeness which animals bear to man—the head of creation.

The resemblance of domestic animals to man is greatly to be attributed to his influence as a higher being modifying those beneath him. Man is the type of all natural things ; thus the races in each country harmonise with their botanical, zoological, and geographical surroundings, and the history of the earth unfolded in its rocks, with the ages when man has lived on earth. Lastly, the elements of which the world is composed shew analogy with the faculties of man's mind.

The quadrumana most resemble man ; their stronghold is in that part of tropical Western Africa, where Negro tribes much like them are found. There are tribes savage and untameable, as the gorilla ; and others, like the chimpanzee, capable of shewing amiable traits under the influence of European masters.

The men most like the agile gibbon have long powerful limbs, small bodies, dark and bright eyes, great skill in balancing, and appear to walk or run with slight effort. But the higher intellectual and moral faculties are not conspicuous in them.

The varieties in the breeds of dogs is as great as in the races of men. Some dogs resemble their owners in expression, which adheres to them when they return to their compeers ; Landseer's picture of "Laying down the law" illustrates this.

Persons like the mastiff are square in build, with mouths drawn down at the corners and daring eyes—a countenance not uncommon in England. Under moral restraint such are faithful to their employers, though gruff and surly ; to those they do not like they are apt to show their teeth—often prominent. These are useful for their vigour and courage in attack and defence. The bull-dog is more given to fighting than the mastiff ; it does not bark much, but rushes on the foe and holds on till death. Such a dog will hold even a man in check. I have seen a person with this physiognomy, a strong but little fellow, not much above five feet ; the mouth had a slight twist on one side, and the nose was exceedingly small and crushed. The greyhound is often like those who train it—entirely occupied with the chase. Swift, clean, and elegant, except in scent, it is less acute than many dogs, and barks little. I remember an individual like the greyhound. Long limbed and faced, and graceful. Addicted to no vice, he was yet an unprofitable member of society, practising no art, and caring little for mental culture. When not hunting, he was as silent and listless as a greyhound at home.

High-nosed races of men are independent, and apt to have a repugnance for what is low ; so amongst dogs, the long and high nosed are not pliable like the spaniel or "King Charles." The sheep dog combines the high nose of a hound with the round head of the spaniel, and it displays two characters. The analogue of the "King Charles" is a small weak-muscled, nervous, delicate, but accomplished man, who benefits others little for want of physical force and single-mindedness.

Men showing a likeness to the lion have shaggy hair about the

forehead, stern, daring eyes, and stiff whiskers which do not hide a grim mouth. Their foreheads, noses, chins, and shoulders are broad. They are more powerful than agile, less crafty than vigorous ; mentally they are more logical than critical. Others are tigerish in aspect and character,—lanky, agile, smooth-haired, full over the eyes, wide mouthed, and slant-eyed, with immense muscular force in proportion to weight. They are ferocious, revengeful, and treacherous, without the magnanimity imputed to the lion and his type. Much of the apparent generosity of the lion may proceed from a more sluggish temperament, less nervous than lymphatic. The tiger seems to be of the bilious-sanguine-nervous temperament. Men of the tiger disposition are similarly constituted. The proportion of the nervous is, however, relatively small. Tippoo Sultan adopted the tiger for his ensign, and was like it in character.

Bear-like men are stout in body, wide in head, immensely powerful in limbs, and are awkward in their way of sitting down. They possess small fierce eyes, and should not be trifled with. Their voices and language are gruff ; they are inclined to be gluttonous and cruel, but have great courage. Their ears are large and stick out ; the hair is thick and dark, but not curly. Fondness for their children is usually the only amiable trait they display.

In the horse, as in man, great variety of temperament and constitution is seen. The sorrel or roan horse has great working power, and can endure with impunity long continued fatigue and exposure. Horses of mixed colour are the most hardy, as for instance, with a light coloured body and black feet—this answers to light complexioned persons with black hair and grey eyes.

In race horses the nervous-bilious temperament is illustrated : these unite the highest nervous sensibility ; greatest muscular development, and just sufficient vital force to carry them on at a rapid rate for a short distance. Neither their temperaments nor mode of life are consistent with a long career. There are men whose course is brilliant and rapid but brief.

In white horses the sanguine-lymphatic temperament is chiefly developed, and is indicated by fleshiness and softness of muscles, and a liability to certain diseases ; they show a resemblance to a class of very fair men, whose hair has a bleached appearance, and are of a scrofulous habit. White horses are milder and quieter, but less serviceable than the black or chestnut. Iron and dappled grey horses have temperaments analogous to the bilious-lymphatic amongst men. They are calm and steady in temper, and rather fleshy in body. The black horse possesses much of the bilious temperament ; in the more delicate breeds the nervous is largely mixed ; when the bilious prevails, there is great power and less excitability. Chestnut horses are of a mixed temperament akin to the bilious-sanguine ; this is accompanied with strength, spirit, and impatience of control. Like men of this temperament, they are not much above the average size ; both are apt to be coarse and violent in manners, and wanting in high qualities. Noble and generous dispositions are more common amongst light coloured horses, particularly bays. They unite intelligence with

strength, and may be compared with men with yellow hair ; such indicates a temperament more "evenly balanced," which is oftener accompanied by a good constitution, and indicates endurance. Cart horses are of the sanguine-lymphatic sanguine-bilious temperaments which must be united with nervous blood from another parent if we would rear horses fit for a variety of purposes. These "cob" horses may be compared with the middle classes in England who can adapt themselves to a greater variety of occupations than those either above or below them. The Arabian horses are more lightly made and more sensitive than gothic. Similar remarks apply to the men inhabiting these countries. The most remarkable nations have sprung from tribes possessing divers but harmonious qualities.

The ass is of the bilious or motive temperament, the fibres of the body are so strong that they may be compared with metallic wires covered with leather. It shows much cunning and obstinacy, perhaps often the result of ill-treatment in youth. Extremely obstinate men, often called asses, are in temperament like this animal.

The manner in which the pig is treated by different nations is in harmony with national origin and filiation. Semitic nations, and through them Mohammedan, abhor this creature, and the Japhetic and those lost among them value it highly. The pig is most typical of the populations of China, Tartary, and the Indian Archipelago, there pig life and pig manners attain their highest development. Chinese pigs and Chinamen are more concave at the root of the nose than British pigs and their masters ; yet our lowest classes who have this concavity often show evidence of Mongolic (Finnic) affinities. A high-toned mind is seldom the accompaniment of a low nose—pigs having the highest qualities have high noses. Various tradesmen are found to resemble the animals they associate with. Butchers have ox eyes ; horse-dealers remind us of the horse ; shepherds of the sheep ; and pig keepers of the pigs.

Men with coarse broad hands and feet, who tower above their contemporaries in height, are often like Samson and Hercules, easily led captive by the softer sex. So elephants are captured by means of trained females, which seduce them into the toils of the hunter ; or caught in pitfalls, they are despatched by their enemies. Such is the fate of some men who are great in nothing but size, and whose figure reminds one of the physical part of the elephant's nature. His more intellectual character as well as a certain resemblance to his *physique* is shared by some men who have good memories and much observation, and are interesting but not beautiful. Here is one of them ; he had a hooked nose, had lost his teeth, and the nose hung over his mouth, his under jaw was prominent, and the thick under lip came up to meet his nose, and nearly attained its object ; he was obliged to push aside this organ when he drank ; he had broad flat ears, and a constitutional asthma was his excuse for a decided grunt when he agreed with the speaker.

The resemblance between national and local breeds of cattle and the populations of their countries is no less striking than between horses and their surroundings. The Englishman, John Bull, is typi-

fied by his ox ; the jealous Spaniard by his excitable cattle ; the wild Hindoo by his zebu ; and the red Devon ox by the red Devonian soil.

The Arabs and Affghans have many of the qualities of the camel ; able for great physical exertion ; they show, in common, much singleness of mind. The Arab and the camel are much alike in expression. There is a resemblance between men and animals with sharp and prominent noses or beaks ; those in the shrew mouse and warbler indicate restlessness and activity ; they poke into obscure corners to seize the smallest insects and display great pugnacity among themselves. The analogy between shrews and a particular class of housewives is acknowledged. Aquiline noses do not stick out like those of the shrew and warbler ; they indicate among birds and men a fierce but lofty character, and are often found in men pre-eminent as rulers. The beak of the parrot must not be confounded with that of the eagle. Men may be found whose noses resemble these imitative birds, they are more curved than those of eagles, and do not rise abruptly on the bridge like that of the grand birds and their types—Wellingtons—but bend down at the tip, are flexible, and move during speech. When goggle eyes accompany this style of nose, we have a voluble parrot amongst men, whose incessant prating, like the cry of the parrot in the forest, is more annoying than the roar of the lion and bear.

Cocks and hens, like horses and dogs, show an analogy to man as regards temperament and complexion. Red fowls most nearly approach the sanguineous, and are most courageous ; light coloured, brown, speckled, and reddish, are most prolific and mild. Red haired men are commonly hot tempered. Black fowls are preferred on account of the size and number of their eggs. The milk of black haired animals is rich, as is that of black haired and skinned women. Black men and animals are more susceptible of cold than light coloured breeds.

The CHAIRMAN mentioned that an extraordinary work had recently been published in America on the subject of the resemblance between man and animals, in which similar views to those of the author of the paper were entertained. If those opinions were correct, there was no telling to what animals man may be like. He said it was approaching somewhat to the Darwinian theory, which was probable, and if that were true, it was natural that there should be all sorts of analogies between man and animals. It might, indeed, be considered an extraordinary chance that we were not animals ourselves. Pointing to some drawings which were exhibited, showing the resemblance between the faces of several men and animals, he said he might think himself fortunate in not coming within the range of those resemblances. If the hypothesis could be established, it might have a practical bearing, for if they could tell what animal a child most resembled they might do a great deal with it. According to the views of the author of the paper man might truly be considered a microcosm, for while all species of animals resembled themselves, man resembled every kind of animal.

Mr. HIGGINS having been called on to express his opinions on the

paper, stated that Mr. Napier's ideas on scientific subjects so entirely differed from his own, that he could not venture on this occasion to offer any remarks on the subject under discussion.

Dr. DONOVAN said it is a subject having a degree of philosophic truth, and is therefore deserving of serious consideration. He objected to that portion of the paper relating to physiognomy, which he contended had no application to practical purposes. There might be some little truth in it, but it could not be applied, since it referred to no first principles. No reason, for instance, could be given why a man with a certain form of nose should have a certain character, for that feature fulfilled no mental office. The only part of the form of man by which character could be tested is the brain, as indicated by the form of the skull. Some men are handsome who are the worst of characters, and others who are considered ugly possess the highest mental and moral qualities; and there could be no judging of the characters of men by the features of their faces. The paper was philosophical because it was suggestive, and raised an important question, but as far as it depended on physiognomy it was delusive. The brain is the book in which the faculties of man are registered, and he hoped Mr. Napier would look into that book, for there he might read and learn what he was anxious to know, and which was worthy of all attention.

Major OWEN considered that in some respects physiognomy was clearly indicative of character, especially the nose. He supported the general views of Mr. Napier, and he laid great stress on embryology as indicative of the resemblance of all forms of animal life. In his opinion it taught that there was but one original form of animal life in nature.

Mr. MACGRIGOR ALLAN supported the general principles of physiognomy, observing that most persons were daily in the habit of judging of the characters of individuals from their features and expressions. He thought physiognomy an important adjunct to phrenology, for as phrenologists could form one idea of the character of a man by the form of his skull, so by looking at his face his sentiments might be known, and it could be perceived whether he was telling the truth by the expression of his eye.

Dr. DONOVAN repeated that physiognomy of itself is most deceptive. He admitted that every part of the body told its own tale, but the various indications must be taken as a whole, and the most important part, the skull, should not be left out of consideration.

Mr. DENDY thought too much dependence was placed on the connection between craniology and phrenology; and, as regarded physiognomy, that too much reliance was placed on the *mere lines* of the face. Physiognomy when technically considered alone was of little value, but when taken in connection with the *expression* of the countenance it referred directly to the mind, through the working of the features. To look to the form of the head alone as an indication of character he thought was altogether a fallacious method, for a man might have the finest developed head with the most depraved mind. Referring more particularly to the paper, he regretted that a great portion of it had been inaudible to him, and he suggested that it

would be better that the Secretary should read papers to the meetings where the authors of them could not make themselves audible.

Mr. CHARLESWORTH expressed a similar opinion. He said that owing probably to not having heard the paper distinctly he could not tell what was its ultimate object, but he supposed that Mr. Napier intended to identify the mind of animals with that of man, and to express the opinion that similar features were associated with similar dispositions. It was a subject generally interesting, and he hoped that the substance of the paper, in a compendious form, should be brought before the Society at a subsequent meeting,

The Rev. DUNBAR I. HEATH said the paper did not relate simply to physiognomy but to the resemblance between man and certain animals, and the essence of it was, as he understood it, that as men are divided into moral, intellectual, and passionate classes, so animals may be similarly classed, and that they are essentially of the same spiritual nature as man. Mr. Heath referred to a passage in the writings of St. Paul which, in the authorised translation from the Greek, is rendered, "we are also His offspring," from which he said it might be inferred that man was connected with superior beings and with the lower animals also. The question raised by the paper was not a question of physiognomy, but whether the small differences between man and animals proved that there was a deeper connection between them, and that, he thought, could hardly be denied. There was no drawing a line, and if so, they must allow to animals the possession of every spiritual quality.

Mr. GROOM NAPIER in replying to the remarks on his paper, adverted in the first place to the observations of the Rev. Dunbar Heath on the previous paper in regard to the Jews and Europeans. He said he considered the Europeans were a moral intellectual race which gave them their superior position; while the Jews displayed moral power without superior intellect. As to the objection raised by Dr. Donovan, on the ground that physiognomy was a deceptive guide to character, he admitted that it might not indicate it so exactly as the form of the skull, but the features indicated certain qualities; and not only the form of the features was a guide to character, but the passing emotions were shown by the expression of the countenance. He dissented from the assertion of Mr. Dendy that a finely-formed head is sometimes accompanied with low moral character, for he never saw a really finely-formed head possessed by a person of a naturally depraved character. Mr. Napier then pointed to and explained a number of drawings of heads and faces which, by their peculiar forms and expressions, indicated character.

The following papers by Mr. Groom Napier were then taken as read:—

On the Classification of Head Forms. By C. O. GROOM NAPIER, Esq.,
F.G.S., F.A.S.L.